

REMARKS

Reconsideration is requested.

The Examiners indication that claims 1-11 contain allowable subject matter, and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, is acknowledged.

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite for failing to point out and claim the subject matter of the invention.

The Office Action states that claim 1, line 11 is confusing and should be rewritten. Claim 1, line 11 has been rewritten. Support for the amendment can be found on page 2, lines 1-3 of Applicants' originally filed specification.

The Office Action states that there is no proper antecedent basis for "said roughing device" in claims 2, 3, 4, and 9. The term "roughing device" is introduced in line 5 of claim 1 and, therefore, a proper antecedent basis does exist. Claims 2, 3, and 9 have been amended to insert "at least one" before the term "roughing device" for increased clarity through increased correspondence with claim 1. No amendment to claim 4 is believed to be appropriate or necessary.

The Office Action states that there is no proper antecedent basis for "said ...devices" in claim 9, lines 4-5. Claim 9 has been amended for increased clarity.


The Office Action states that there is no proper antecedent basis for "the material" in claim 11, line 1. Claim 11 has been amended for increased clarity.

This application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance, and action to that end is respectfully requested. If the Examiner's next anticipated action is anything other than a Notice of Allowance, the undersigned respectfully requests a telephone interview prior to issuance of any such subsequent action. The undersigned is available for telephone consultation at any time.

Respectfully submitted,

Natalino Modesti et al.

Dated: Nov. 30, 2005

By: 
Deepak Malhotra
Reg. No. 33,560